DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 472 EA 006 318

TITLE	State Education Priorities: A Poll of State-Level Education Policymakers -- 1974.
INSTITUTION	Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo.
PUB DATE	74
NOTE	15p.; A related document is EA 006 319
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Collective Negotiation; Educational Finance; *Educational Policy; Handicapped Children; *Local Issues; *National Surveys; *Opinions; *State Officials

ABSTRACT

The Education Commission of the States (ECS) conducted a poll in early 1974 of the seven ECS commissioners in each of the member States. The commissioners were asked to indicate the degree of concern in their State on each of 18 issues confronting education in the States. Financing schools and colleges was identified as the most urgent concern by those polled. The next greatest concerns identified were collective bargaining and providing education services for handicapped children. Three emerging education issues identified by the commissioners were coordinating and expanding lifelong learning and community education programs, coordinating State education services with other agencies, and equalizing employment opportunities for women in education. Issues of little concern included interstate school finance, equalization, and comparing achievement among the States. (Author/JF)

ED 094472

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

State Education Priorities

A POLL OF STATE-LEVEL EDUCATION POLICYMAKERS – 1974

The Education Commission of the States (ECS) is a nonprofit organization formed by interstate compact in 1966 to further working relationships among governors, state legislators and educators for the improvement of education at all levels. Each of the 45 member states, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands is represented on the commission by seven ECS Commissioners. They usually include the governor, two state legislators, two educators and two laypersons. Thus, the 329 ECS Commissioners constitute a national cross-section of state-level education policy opinion.

EA 006 318

I. INTRODUCTION

At a meeting in Honolulu in the fall of 1973 the ECS Steering Committee approved the following motion:

> That the ECS staff be directed to involve the ECS Commissioners more fully in the development of programs and priorities by the following means: A survey of commissioners at least three times a year on policy issues deserving ECS attention, including the theme and content of the annual meeting. . . .

Following the Honolulu meeting, responsibility for conducting such polls was assigned to the ECS Communications Department. The first poll was conducted during January and February 1974. The seven ECS commissioners in each of the 45 member states, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, were asked to indicate the degree of concern in their state on each of 18 "urgent and emerging issues confronting education in the states."* Results of the first poll were submitted to the steering committee at its meeting in Denver on March 1, 1974.

II. SUMMARY OF RESULTS

A total of 233 commissioners, 72 per cent of the 324 to whom questionnaires were mailed, responded to the first poll.

Financing schools and colleges was identified as the most urgent concern of those polled, a group that included governors, state legislators, educators and laypersons.

The next greatest concerns identified were collective bargaining with teachers and faculty members and providing education services for handicapped children.

The commissioners identified three emerging education issues: coordinating and expanding lifelong learning and community education programs, coordinating state education services with other agencies and equalizing employment opportunities for women in education.

Issues of little concern included interstate school finance equalization and comparing pupil achievement among the states.

III. RESPONSE

Questionnaires for the poll were mailed on Jan. 21, 1974 to 324 commissioners in 45 ECS member states, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. At the time of the mailing, five commissioner positions were vacant. When the results were tabulated on Feb. 27, 233 commissioners had responded -- 72 per cent of those to whom questionnaires had been mailed.

---

* See Appendix A, page 11, for full text of questionnaire.

Commissioners were divided into four categories: governors, state legislators, educators and laypersons. Responses were divided as follows:

Category	Number	Responses	Per Cent
Governors	46	33	72
Legislators	103	53	51
Educators	115	100	87
Laypersons	60	44	73

(Note: The total number of responses shown above is three short of the 233 who responded. Three commissioners returned their responses in uncoded envelopes and so could not be categorized. Their responses are included in the totals, however.)

In addition, commissioners were divided into steering committee members and non-steering-committee members. Responses were received from 38 of the 47 steering committee members -- 81 per cent -- and from 195 of 277 non-governing-board members -- 71 per cent.

IV. PRIORITIES

Commissioners were asked which three of the 18 issues were of top priority in their state. Following are the responses, in rank order, with the number of commissioners citing each issue indicated:

1. Intrastate Equalization.....124
2. Postsecondary Funding.....77
3. Collective Bargaining.....74
4. Services to Handicapped.....65
5. Local, State, Federal Roles.....49
6. Coordinate Manpower Needs.....43
7. Coordinate State Planning.....41
8. Intrastate Comparison.....40
9. Teacher Certification.....35
10. Influence Federal Aid.....25
11. Early Childhood Services.....22

12. Awareness of State Role.....17

13. Coordinate With State Agencies.....16

14. Lifelong Learning.....14

15. Women's Job Opportunities.....14

16. H.S. Graduation Standards.....10

17. Interstate Equalization.....9

18. Interstate Comparison.....5

In addition, the commissioners were asked to identify emerging issues in their states. Three issues were identified by 20-25 per cent of those responding: coordination and expansion of lifelong learning and community education programs, coordination of state education services with other agencies and equalizing employment opportunities for women in education.

Seven issues were cited as emerging by 15-20 per cent of the commissioners: intrastate comparison of pupil achievement, interstate equalization of school finance, interstate comparison of pupil achievement, coordinated statewide planning procedures, early childhood services, coordinating education programs with anticipated manpower needs and increasing public awareness of the state role in education.

The commissioners also were asked to identify additional policy or practice concerns that had come to their attention in the past year -- concerns that were not included among the 18 issues listed on the questionnaire.* The three most frequently cited in one form or another were: improved articulation among the various levels of education; funding nonpublic schools and colleges and providing alternatives to the existing school and college system.

V. PERCEPTIONS

Do different kinds of commissioners view the same issues differently? ECS commissioners vary according to their roles within their states. Some are governors, some are educators, others are state legislators. They vary, too, according to their function within the commission, for one commissioner from each member state serves on the ECS Steering Committee.

Following are detailed perceptions of the 18 issues by seven commissioner categories: all commissioners, steering committee members, non-steering-committee members, governors, state legislators, educators and laypersons:

---

* The impact of the energy crisis was excluded.

ECS COMMISSIONERS - 233

	Urgent	Locally Important	General Concern	Emerging	No Issue
1. Intrastate Equalization	99	58	40	10	22
2. Interstate Equalization	9	18	60	32	101
3. Local, State, Fed. Roles	64	46	74	27	18
4. Coordinate State Planning	70	35	64	37	25
5. Services to Handicapped	90	45	55	19	23
6. Early Childhood Services	34	60	59	38	35
7. Coordinate With State Agencies	24	36	77	53	39
8. Postsecondary Funding	85	53	46	26	15
9. H.S. Graduation Standards	21	26	58	46	72
10. Intrastate Comparison	48	35	73	43	29
11. Interstate Comparison	12	18	48	34	104
12. Coordinate Manpower Needs	65	50	66	31	17
13. Teacher Certification	75	30	69	25	29
14. Collective Bargaining	92	64	34	28	9
15. Influence Federal Aid	57	57	69	27	18
16. Awareness of State Role	46	38	80	32	35
17. Lifelong Learning	24	52	59	55	35
18. Women's Job Opportunities	24	51	74	45	30

STEERING COMMITTEE - 38

	Urgent	Locally Important	General Concern	Emerging	No Issue
1. Intrastate Equalization	17	7	7	1	6
2. Interstate Equalization			11	5	19
3. Local, State, Fed. Roles	13	7	12	2	2
4. Coordinate State Planning	7	5	13	8	5
5. Services to Handicapped	14	7	8	3	6
6. Early Childhood Services	5	10	10	3	9
7. Coordinate With State Agencies	3	6	11	9	7
8. Postsecondary Funding	15	10	5	4	2
9. H.S. Graduation Standards	3	1	9	7	15
10. Intrastate Comparison	8	2	16	8	3
11. Interstate Comparison		1	7	9	16
12. Coordinate Manpower Needs	10	7	13	3	4
13. Teacher Certification	8	6	13	3	5
14. Collective Bargaining	15	11	7	2	2
15. Influence Federal Aid	9	10	14	2	
16. Awareness of State Role	5	5	12	6	9
17. Lifelong Learning		6	12	7	9
18. Women's Job Opportunities	5	3	15	9	4

NON-STEERING COMMITTEE - 195

	Urgent	Locally Important	General Concern	Emerging	No Issue
1. Intrastate Equalization	82	51	33	9	16
2. Interstate Equalization	9	18	49	27	82
3. Local, State, Fed. Roles	51	39	62	25	16
4. Coordinate State Planning	63	30	51	29	20
5. Services to Handicapped	76	38	47	16	17
6. Early Childhood Services	29	50	49	35	26
7. Coordinate With State Agencies	21	30	66	44	32
8. Postsecondary Funding	70	43	41	22	13
9. H.S. Graduation Standards	18	25	49	39	57
10. Intrastate Comparison	40	33	57	35	26
11. Interstate Comparison	12	17	41	25	88
12. Coordinate Manpower Needs	55	43	53	28	13
13. Teacher Certification	67	24	56	22	24
14. Collective Bargaining	77	53	27	26	7
15. Influence Federal Aid	48	47	55	25	18
16. Awareness of State Role	41	33	68	26	26
17. Lifelong Learning	21	46	47	48	26
18. Women's Job Opportunities	19	48	59	36	26

GOVERNORS - 33

	Urgent	Locally Important	General Concern	Emerging	No Issue
1. Intrastate Equalization	15	5	10		3
2. Interstate Equalization	1	2	8	4	17
3. Local, State, Fed. Roles	9	6	13	4	1
4. Coordinate State Planning	10	3	9	8	3
5. Services to Handicapped	17	9	1	3	3
6. Early Childhood Services	7	11	7	6	2
7. Coordinate With State Agencies	6	5	15	5	2
8. Postsecondary Funding	14	5	11	1	1
9. H.S. Graduation Standards	2	3	11	6	10
10. Intrastate Comparison	6	6	14	5	1
11. Interstate Comparison	2	3	9	4	13
12. Coordinate Manpower Needs	13	6	9	3	1
13. Teacher Certification	6	7	11	3	4
14. Collective Bargaining	14	10	5	3	
15. Influence Federal Aid	10	6	12	3	1
16. Awareness of State Role	6	2	12	4	8
17. Lifelong Learning		11	8	10	4
18. Women's Job Opportunities	2	4	14	11	2

LEGISLATORS - 53

	Urgent	Locally Important	General Concern	Emerging	No Issue
1. Intrastate Equalization	22	14	7	2	7
2. Interstate Equalization	1	4	9	10	25
3. Local, State, Fed. Roles	12	11	17	7	6
4. Coordinate State Planning	15	8	10	12	6
5. Services to Handicapped	21	10	10	6	5
6. Early Childhood Services	7	11	11	10	11
7. Coordinate With State Agencies	9	4	15	14	10
8. Postsecondary Funding	15	14	8	10	4
9. H.S. Graduation Standards	2	6	13	6	21
10. Intrastate Comparison	11	6	20	8	8
11. Interstate Comparison	2	2	11	6	25
12. Coordinate Manpower Needs	14	13	13	7	6
13. Teacher Certification	15	5	16	9	7
14. Collective Bargaining	22	12	8	5	2
15. Influence Federal Aid	13	13	13	5	6
16. Awareness of State Role	8	14	16	6	9
17. Lifelong Learning	5	12	8	12	13
18. Women's Job Opportunities	3	9	15	9	12

EDUCATORS - 100

	Urgent	Locally Important	General Concern	Emerging	No Issue
1. Intrastate Equalization	47	25	14	5	6
2. Interstate Equalization	5	9	33	12	38
3. Local, State, Fed. Roles	23	23	33	11	9
4. Coordinate State Planning	32	16	33	12	7
5. Services to Handicapped	40	17	29	6	8
6. Early Childhood Services	17	29	24	15	12
7. Coordinate With State Agencies	6	20	37	22	14
8. Postsecondary Funding	40	25	16	11	6
9. H.S. Graduation Standards	9	13	26	20	31
10. Intrastate Comparison	22	11	28	20	17
11. Interstate Comparison	5	7	19	15	51
12. Coordinate Manpower Needs	27	20	34	13	6
13. Teacher Certification	40	12	28	8	12
14. Collective Bargaining	35	29	13	16	7
15. Influence Federal Aid	22	25	32	13	8
16. Awareness of State Role	23	16	33	14	14
17. Lifelong Learning	12	23	32	22	10
18. Women's Job Opportunities	15	32	31	13	9

LAYPERSONS - 44

	Urgent	Locally Important	General Concern	Emerging	No Issue
1. Intrastate Equalization	13	14	9	3	5
2. Interstate Equalization	2	3	8	6	20
3. Local, State, Fed. Roles	18	6	11	4	2
4. Coordinate State Planning	13	8	10	5	8
5. Services to Handicapped	12	8	14	4	6
6. Early Childhood Services	3	8	16	6	10
7. Coordinate With State Agencies	3	6	10	12	11
8. Postsecondary Funding	15	9	11	3	3
9. H S. Graduation Standards	8	4	6	14	9
10. Intrastate Comparison	9	11	10	9	3
11. Interstate Comparison	3	6	8	8	14
12. Coordinate Manpower Needs	11	11	8	8	4
13. Teacher Certification	12	5	14	5	6
14. Collective Bargaining	19	13	7	4	
15. Influence Federal Aid	11	12	11	6	3
16. Awareness of State Role	9	6	16	8	4
17. Lifelong Learning	6	5	10	11	8
18. Women's Job Opportunities	4	6	12	12	7

VI. ANALYSIS

Despite commissioner disparity, there was little significant difference in the way commissioners rated the issues. On only two of the 18 items was there more than a 10 per cent difference between steering committee and non-steering-committee members. Non-committee members were twice as likely to consider the coordination of state planning as urgent -- 32 per cent to 16 per cent. And steering committee members, 19 per cent, were less inclined than non-committee members, 34 per cent, to regard revising teacher certification standards as urgent.

Perceptions of emerging issues was closer. Only on interstate comparison of pupil achievement was the variance greater than 10 per cent. Twenty-four per cent of steering committee members responding regarded this as a future issue; only 13 per cent of other commissioners did so.

While educating handicapped children ranked fourth overall, a majority of the governors responding, 51 per cent, ranked it as their No. 1 education concern. Only lay commissioners failed to rank this issue as one of their top three concerns.

Legislators and educators agreed that their most urgent concern was distributing funds more equitably among local school districts in each state.

Legislators and lay commissioners agreed that collective bargaining problems were among their top concerns. Neither governors nor educators ranked this issue so highly.

While issues pertaining to education governance did not, in and of themselves, rank highly, four governance issues were ranked highly by one-fourth of all commissioners: proper local, state and federal roles -- 27 per cent; statewide education planning -- 29 per cent; coordinating education with manpower needs -- 28 per cent; and influencing federal aid programs -- 24 per cent.

VII. FUTURE POLLS

In submitting the results of the first poll to the ECS Steering Committee, the Communications Department made the following recommendations:

1. That a follow-up poll be conducted before the ECS Annual Meeting in June.

2. That the follow-up poll be devoted to three issues: education finance, both elementary-secondary and post-secondary; education governance and education programs for handicapped children.

3. That the results of the first poll be disseminated to the news media.

4. That a final report of the first poll be prepared and shared with all ECS Commissioners.

These recommendations were adopted by the steering committee on March 1, 1974.

A second poll questionnaire was mailed to ECS Commissioners on May 13, 1974, along with copies of this report on the first poll.

APPENDIX

In conducting its first poll of commissioners, ECS employed the services of a consultant to assist in preparing the questionnaire and to provide data-processing services. The consultant was Mrs. Polly Carithers, public information director for the Oakland Schools, the intermediate school district serving Oakland County, Michigan. Mrs. Carithers has conducted a number of opinion polls and surveys for the 26 local school systems served by the Oakland Schools. She is the author of a book, How to Conduct Low Cost Surveys, published by the National School Public Relations Association. Commissioners sent their completed questionnaires to Mrs. Carithers in self-addressed coded envelopes. The code indicated whether the response was from a governor, legislator, educator or layperson -- steering committee or non-steering-committee member. No one at ECS knows how an individual commissioner responded, and Mrs. Carithers destroyed the questionnaires after the date-processing had been completed.

Following are the contents of this appendix:

A. Copy of the questionnaire.

B. Copy of the cover letter to commissioners from the ECS Executive Director.

C. Sample page of the computer printout of final data.

D. Copy of the news release on the results of the poll.

APPENDIX A

With a vertical pencil line through the appropriate bracket, indicate the degree of concern in your state on the following issues:

MARK
① Urgent
② Important in some localities
③ Some generalized concern
④ Emerging as an issue
⑤ Not an issue at this time

1	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1. Equalization of school finance within the state.
2	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	2. Equalization of school finance among the states.
3	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	3. Determining proper roles of local, state & federal govt. in planning & funding programs.
4	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	4. Developing coordinated state wide education planning procedures.
5	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	5. Coordination of expansion & funding services to the handicapped.
6	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	6. Coordination of expansion & funding early childhood services.
7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	7. Coordination of state education services with other agencies.
8	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	8. Funding postsecondary education.
9	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	9. Establishing and enforcing minimum performance standards for high school graduation.
10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	10. Developing means of valid comparison of pupil achievement within the state.
11	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	11. Developing means of valid comparison of pupil achievement among the states.
12	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	12. Coordinating education programs with anticipated manpower needs.
13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	13. Revising procedures and standards for teacher certification.
14	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	14. Collective bargaining problems.
15	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	15. Increasing state influence on the development and implementation of federal aid programs.
16	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	16. Increasing public awareness of the state role in education.
17	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	17. Coordination and expansion of lifelong learning and community education programs.
18	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	18. Equalizing employment opportunities for women in education.
19	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	19. Which three of the above issues do you believe have top priority in your state? Indicate by number in boxes at right. → ☐ ☐ ☐
20	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	20. What additional concern in educational policy or practice (other than the energy crisis) has come to your attention in the past year?

INSTRUCTIONS: USE NO. 2 BLACK LEAD PENCIL (not ink or ball point) FOR MARKS. MAKE MARKS HEAVY AND DARK. ERASE COMPLETELY ANY MARKS YOU WISH TO CHANGE.

APPENDIX B

Education Commission of the States
300 LINCOLN TOWER • 1860 LINCOLN STREET
DENVER, COLORADO 80203 • (303) 893-5200

January 21, 1974

Dear Commissioner:

Your participation in a poll of ECS Commissioners would be appreciated. At the Steering Committee meeting in Honolulu, a motion was adopted that the commissioners be polled "at least three times a year on policy issues deserving ECS attention."

The questionnaire for the first of these polls is enclosed. It has been designed to provide the ECS staff and Steering Committee with a means of identifying the most urgent and emerging issues confronting education in the states.

Please fill out this questionnaire and mail it in the envelope provided to our consultant, Mrs. Polly Carithers. Your responses should reflect your perception of concerns within your state, not your personal feelings regarding these issues. You will note we have tried not to duplicate questions included in the recent evaluation questionnaire. Also, we have deliberately not included such obvious issues as the energy crisis and accountability.

We plan to disclose the results of this first poll at the Steering Committee meeting in Denver on March 1. At that time, the governing board will be asked to approve a more intensive follow-up poll on the two, three or four most urgent issues. Results of the second poll will be disclosed in June at the ECS Annual Meeting in Miami.

Mailed questionnaires produce information that can be considered representative only if the response is 80 per cent or better. Therefore, we need your help in completing this questionnaire and returning it as soon as possible.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Wendell H. Pierce
Executive Director

WHP:fk
Enclosure

LEGISLATORS ¶ CYCLE NUMBER 2
ARGUMENTS WERE 1 ROLES WERE F S FIELDS WE
N= 53 (APPENDIX C)

Q. POS
1 1 INTRASTATE EQUALIZATION *URGENT= 22, = 41% *LOCALLY IMPORTANT= 14,
EMERGING AS ISSUE= 2, = 3% *NOT NOW AN ISSUE= 7, = 13% *9= 1, = 1%
MEAN= 1.3 SD= 1.7 I- - XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXCXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXI- - - - -I- - - - - -
Q. POS
2 2 INTERSTATE EQUALIZATION *URGENT= 1, = 1% *LOCALLY IMPORTANT= 4,
EMERGING AS ISSUE= 10, = 18% *NOT NOW AN ISSUE= 25, = 47% *5= 1, = 1% *6=
MEAN= 3.4 SD= 1.6 I- - - - - -I- - - - -I- - - -XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXOXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
Q. POS
3 3 ROLES LOCAL STATE FEES *URGENT= 12, = 22% *LOCALLY IMPORTANT= 11,
EMERGING AS ISSUE= 7, = 13% *NOT NOW AN ISSUE= 6, = 11%
MEAN= 1.7 SD= 1.3 I- - - - -I- -XXXXXXXXXXXXXCXXXXXXXXXXXXXXI- - - - -I- - - - - -
Q. POS
4 4 COORDINATE STATE PLANNING *URGENT= 15, = 28% *LOCALLY IMPORTANT= 8,
19% *EMERGING AS ISSUE= 12, = 22% / 23% *NOT NOW AN ISSUE= 6, = 11% *7=
MEAN= 1.9 SD= 1.6 I- - - - -I-XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXCXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX - - -I- - - - -
Q. POS
5 5 COORDINATE HANDICAPPED *URGENT= 21, = 39% *LOCALLY IMPORTANT= 10,
EMERGING AS ISSUE= 6, = 11% *NOT NOW AN ISSUE= 5, = 9% *6= 1, = 1%
MEAN= 1.4 SD= 1.5 I- - - - XXXXXXXXXXXXCXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX-I- - - - -I- - - - -
Q. POS
6 6 COOR EARLY CHILDHOOD SER *URGENT= 7, = 13% *LOCALLY IMPORTANT= 11,
EMERGING AS ISSUE= 10, = 18% *NOT NOW AN ISSUE= 11, = 20% *5= 2, = 3% *9=
MEAN= 2.4 SD= 1.7 I- - - - -I- - -XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXOXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX- - - - -
Q. POS
7 7 COOR WITH STATE AGENCIES *URGENT= 9, = 16% *LOCALLY IMPORTANT= 4,
EMERGING AS ISSUE= 14, = 25% *NOT NOW AN ISSUE= 10, = 19% *5= 1, = 1%
MEAN= 2.3 SD= 1.4 I- - - - -I- - - - XXXXXXXXXXXXXOXXXXXXXXXXXXX- -I- - - - -
Q. POS
8 8 POST SECONDARY FUNDING *URGENT= 15, = 28% *LOCALLY IMPORTANT= 14,
EMERGING AS ISSUE= 10, = 18% *NOT NOW AN ISSUE= 4, = 7% *5= 1, = 1% *6=
MEAN= 1.8 SD= 1.5 I- - - - -IXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXOXXXXXXXXXXXXXX - - - -I- - - - -
Q. POS
9 9 MINIMUM PERF FOR HS GRADE *URGENT= 2, = 3% *LOCALLY IMPORTANT= 6,
2% *EMERGING AS ISSUE= 6, = 11% *NOT NOW AN ISSUE= 21, = 39% / 40% *5=
MEAN= 2.9 SD= 1.4 I- - - - -I- - - - -I- - XXXXXXXXXXXXXXCXXXXXXXXXXXXXX - - -
Q. POS
10 10 INTRASTATE COMPARISON *URGENT= 11, = 20% *LOCALLY IMPORTANT= 6,
EMERGING AS ISSUE= 8, = 15% *NOT NOW AN ISSUE= 8, = 15%
MEAN= 1.9 SD= 1.3 I- - - - -I- - -XXXXXXXXXXXXXCXXXXXXXXXXXXX- - - -I- - - - -
Q. POS
11 11 INTERSTATE COMPARISON *URGENT= 2, = 3% *LOCALLY IMPORTANT= 2,
EMERGING AS ISSUE= 6, = 11% *NOT NOW AN ISSUE= 25, = 47% *5= 3, = 5% *6=
MEAN= 3.5 SD= 1.7 I- - - - -I- - - - -I- - - -XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXOXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
Q. POS
12 12 COOR MANPOWER NEEDS *URGENT= 14, = 26% *LOCALLY IMPORTANT= 13,
EMERGING AS ISSUE= 7, = 13% *NOT NOW AN ISSUE= 6, = 11%
MEAN= 1.6 SD= 1.3 I- - - - -I-XXXXXXXXXXXXXOXXXXXXXXXXXXX-I- - - - -I- - - - -
Q. POS
13 13 CERTIFICATION STANDARDS *URGENT= 15, = 28% *LOCALLY IMPORTANT= 5,
EMERGING AS ISSUE= 9, = 16% *NOT NOW AN ISSUE= 7, = 13% *8= 1, = 1%
MEAN= 1.9 SD= 1.6 I- - - - -I-XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXCXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX- - -I- - - - -
Q. POS
14 14 COLLECTIVE BARGAINING *URGENT= 22, = 41% *LOCALLY IMPORTANT= 12,
EMERGING AS ISSUE= 5, = 9% *NOT NOW AN ISSUE= 2, = 3% *5= 1, = 1% *7=
MEAN= 1.5 SD= 2.1 I- -XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXCXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX- -I- - - - -

APPENDIX D

Education Commission of the States
300 LINCOLN TOWER • 1860 LINCOLN STREET
DENVER, COLORADO 80203 • (303) 893-5200

NEWS RELEASE

CONTACT: John Chaffee
(303) 893-5200

RELEASE: Immediate

SCHOOL FINANCE IS TOP CONCERN OF STATE EDUCATION LEADERS

DENVER - Financing schools and colleges is the most urgent concern of those responsible for education in the states, including governors and state legislators, according to a poll by the Education Commission of the States (ECS).

The next greatest concerns are collective bargaining with teachers and faculty members and providing education services for handicapped children.

ECS is a Denver-based organization of state political and educational leaders. Each of its 47 member states, including Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, is represented by seven commissioners. These usually include the governor, two state legislators, two educators and two lay persons.

This group was polled on 18 current and emerging education issues. Results of the poll were released Feb. 28 at a meeting of the ECS Steering Committee.

Their No. 1 concern: distributing funds more equitably among local school districts in each state. Funding colleges and universities was cited as the second greatest problem.

While educating handicapped children ranked fourth overall, a majority of the governors said it is their top education concern.

MORE

A total of 324 ECS commissioners were polled, including 46 governors, 103 legislators, 115 educators and 60 lay persons. Responses were received from 233 commissioners, 72 per cent of those polled.

Thirty-three governors, 53 legislators, 100 educators and 44 lay persons responded.

The commissioners identified three emerging education issues: coordinating and expanding lifelong learning and community education programs, coordinating state education services with other agencies and equalizing employment opportunities for women in education.

Issues of little concern included interstate school finance equalization and comparing pupil achievement among the states.

# # #

ECS #8
2-28-74